

## REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated September 8, 2006, wherein the Examiner rejected claims 1, 8, 14, 30-32, 34 and 48-56, all the claims now pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments made herein and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Prior to discussing the prior art objections, Applicant notes the Examiner's objections to paragraphs 69, 70 and 71 (on pages 10-11) of the specification. In response to the Examiner's objections, these paragraphs have been amended to overcome the informalities noted by the Examiner.

In addition, the Examiner objected to certain language in claim 8. In response, Applicant has amended claim 8 to overcome the informalities noted by the Examiner.

Before discussing the prior art objections of the Examiner, Applicant wishes to set forth a few brief comments in connection with the claimed invention. Applicant has discovered a unique orienting means for aligning the separable edge of the outermost sheet on the wound roll of a cleaning device so that the separable edge is in registration with a certain location on the roll support. This facilitates locating the separable edge of the outermost sheet so as to enable easy removal of the outermost sheet from the roll.

In particular, the inventive cleaning device or apparatus comprises a roll assembly that includes a wound roll of adhesive sheets and a support element for rotatably supporting the roll assembly. Significantly, first means carried on

the roll assembly and second means carried on the support element are releasably engageable with one another only when said roll assembly is at a specific rotatable position relative to said support element. This enables the orienting of the edge of each sheet of the wound roll, as the edge of each sheet becomes the outermost edge of the roll (during use), at a predetermined angular location relative to the support element.

Turning now to the prior art rejections, the Examiner rejects the pending claims as anticipated based on the teachings and the patents to Sohmer and Barela. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With reference to the Sohmer patent, the Examiner references projections or prongs 28a, 28b as one of the orienting means and “space members” defined by the roll core as also part of the orienting means. However, both projections or prongs 28a, 28b and the roll core (the description at column 3, lines 3-4 states that the prongs “grasp the internal surface of tube 23”) are both carried by the roll assembly of Sohmer. As the Examiner admits in his rejection, the roll assembly includes end caps 21, 22 with a cylindrical section 27 having projections or prongs 28a, 28b fixedly grasping the inner tube 23 of roller 10; all of these elements rotate with one another as part of roller 10. There is a support element comprising handle 12 and spindle elements 19, 20 about which roller 10 is rotatable. However, there is no means carried on the support element that is releasably engageable with projections or prongs 28a, 28b as the Examiner mistakenly suggests. Indeed, there is no cooperating mechanism carried by both the support element and the roller assembly of Sohmer for orienting the edge of

the outermost roll sheet at a predetermined angular location relative to the support element, in contrast to what is claimed in the subject application.

In the patent to Barela, the Examiner, in his rejection, suggests that the roll support of the Barela device includes handle 42 and spindle or shaft 27, and that the roll assembly includes a roll 12 and a rotatable member defined by end cap 72. The Examiner then goes on to equate the orienting means defined in the claim with plug 74, extending from end cap 72, and slots 76 formed within disc 78 (see Fig. 8). However, what the Examiner again ignores is that both end caps 72, which carries plug 74, and disc 78, which carries slots 76, are locked together with one another at assembly (see column 4, lines 62-65). End cap 72 and disc 78 are both thus part of the roll assembly and freely rotate together relative to end 35 of handle 42 (part of the roll support element). Thus, in the Barela device, there is no separate element carried on the roll assembly and a separate element carried on the support element for releasably engaging with one another when said roll assembly is at a specific rotatable position relative to the support element, as affirmatively recited in amended claim 1.

Thus, neither Sohmer nor Barela provide any type of mechanism for rotatably orienting the edge of the outermost sheet of a wound roll at a predetermined angular location relative to a support element.

Early and favorable Action is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required, or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 07-1730.



Respectfully submitted,

GOTTLIEB, RACKMAN & REISMAN, P.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)  
270 Madison Avenue, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10016  
(212) 684-3900

Jeffrey M. Kadeh  
Reg. No. 31,268

Dated: December 21, 2006

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR §1.10**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service via First Class mail service in a post-paid envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria , VA 22313-1450 on December 21, 2006

*Evelyn Gushard*  
Evelyn Gushard